REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above Amendment and these Remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed November 20, 2007. Claims 1-33 were pending prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-33. This Response amends claims 1, 13, 23, and 33, leaving for the Examiner's consideration claims 1-33. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-12 and 33 are rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter: "*A system to provide a software debugging environment...*".

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102 and § 103

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 13-17, 19, 23-27, 29, and 33 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0278585 to Spencer.

Claims 7, 10-12, 18, 20-22, 28 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer in view of Charisius (art of record, U.S. Patent No. 7,051,316.

Here, independent claims 1, 13, 23, and 33 are all amended to include, "*wherein the abstract content of the at least one data structure constitutes attributes of interest during the execution of the executing software program rather than physical structures used to represent the abstract content.*"

The above amendment can be explained by the example described in **[0005]**. In the example, a developer might use a data structure called a List to represent an ordered collection of items on an invoice. In the present invention embodied in claim 1, the debugger can allow the developer to see the abstract content of the List, such as the list of items and their attributes of interest during the execution of the executing software program (e.g., quantity, price, description), instead of the physical structure such as a bunch of pointers that are used to implement the List data structure using a linked list of nodes.

Different from the present invention, Spencer focuses on showing the expressions and information in a floating or movable window, either above the source code, or attached to the source code in the locations that they are relevant to. (Spencer, Paragraph **0022**, Line **10-13**). Hence, Spencer cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious, since only variables and expressions in the physical structures (the linked list in the above example), not the abstract content (the List in the above example), are shown in Spencer. Therefore, independent claims 1, 13, 23, and 33 should all be in allowable condition.

In addition, dependent claims 2-12, which are based on independent claim 1; dependent claims 14-22, which are based on independent claim 13; and dependent claims 24-32, which are based on independent claim 23, should also be in allowable condition.

Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application are allowable, and Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 19, 2008   By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
                                                    Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                                    Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800